

## Linking the Big Five personality constructs to organizational commitment

Jesse Erdheim<sup>a,\*</sup>, Mo. Wang<sup>b</sup>, Michael J. Zickar<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Psychology Department, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403, USA*

<sup>b</sup> *Department of Psychology, Portland State University, USA*

Received 11 October 2005; received in revised form 20 March 2006

Available online 2 June 2006

---

### Abstract

This study explored the linkages between the five-factor model of personality and Meyer and Allen's (1991) model of organizational commitment using a field sample. Results indicated that Extraversion was significantly related to affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience were all significantly related to continuance commitment. Lastly, Agreeableness was significantly related to normative commitment. Theoretical and practical implications of the results are discussed.

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Five-factor model of personality; Organizational commitment

---

### 1. Introduction

Over the past two decades, organizational commitment has become a highly researched job attitude. Indeed, commitment has been the subject of several meta-analyses (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002), theoretical reviews (Lawler, 1992; Reichers, 1985), and one overview book (Meyer & Allen,

---

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 419 372 4396.

E-mail address: [jerdhei@bgnet.bgsu.edu](mailto:jerdhei@bgnet.bgsu.edu) (J. Erdheim).

1997), largely because employees with low levels of commitment are more likely to leave their organizations (Meyer et al., 2002). Although the antecedents of commitment have received increased attention, environmental rather than dispositional sources are typically considered, despite a surge in research looking at the dispositional sources of other job attitudes, such as job satisfaction (e.g., Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002).

The logic underlying the individual difference approach to understanding job attitudes is twofold: theoretically, an attitude has been defined as a psychological tendency that is expressed by an evaluation (favorable or unfavorable) of a particular entity (Eagley & Chaiken, 1993), which maps onto the prevailing conceptualization of job satisfaction; empirically, research has provided evidence that some individuals may be dispositionally predisposed to experience heightened or diminished levels of job satisfaction (e.g., Staw & Ross, 1985). In the past 15 years, as studies have continued to explore this question, evidence has continued to mount supporting this trend, lending credence to the argument that job satisfaction is, at least partially, dispositionally based (House, Shane, & Herold, 1996). Interestingly, so far only minimal attention has been directed toward understanding the dispositional basis of organizational commitment.

Although research has investigated relationships between an isolated facet of personality and organizational commitment (e.g., Cropanzano, James, & Konovsky, 1993; Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren, & de Chermont, 2003), all of these studies have employed the positive affectivity (PA)–negative affectivity (NA) taxonomy of affective temperament (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), despite meta-analysis demonstrating that Conscientiousness is related to job satisfaction, and unlike Extraversion and Neuroticism, is a Big Five personality trait not subsumed under the PA–NA typology (Judge et al., 2002). Because organizational commitment, like job satisfaction, is a job attitude, the five-factor model of personality may include traits not covered by the PA–NA typology that provide a more in-depth understanding of commitment development.

As such, the application of the Big Five model may provide much needed integration in this literature. However, to date, we are not aware of any studies that have investigated the relationship between the Big Five and organizational commitment. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to assess the relationship between these constructs to better understand the dispositional basis of organizational commitment.

### *1.1. The five-factor model of personality*

The Big Five model implies that personality consists of five relatively independent dimensions that altogether provide a meaningful taxonomy for the study of individual differences. Our interpretation of the Big Five directly corresponds to our measurement of the five-factor model of personality. The first factor we measured was Extraversion. The behavioral tendencies used to measure this factor include being sociable, gregarious, assertive, talkative, and active (Barrick & Mount, 1991). The second factor that we explored was Neuroticism. It represents individual differences in the tendency to experience distress (McCrae & John, 1992). Typical behaviors associated with this factor include being anxious, depressed, angry, embarrassed, emotional, worried, and insecure (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

Agreeableness was the third factor we examined. It describes the humane aspects of people—characteristics such as altruism, nurturance, caring, and emotional support at one end of the dimension, and hostility, indifference to others, self-centeredness, spitefulness, and jealousy at

the other end (Digman, 1990). The behavioral tendencies typically associated with this factor include being courteous, flexible, trusting, good-natured, cooperative, forgiving, soft-hearted, and tolerant (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

The fourth factor we looked at is referred to as Conscientiousness. It is related to dependability and volition and the typical behaviors associated with it include being hard-working, achievement-oriented, persevering, careful, and responsible (Barrick & Mount, 1991). The last factor we explored was Openness to Experience, which is related to scientific and artistic creativity, divergent thinking, and political liberalism (see Judge et al., 2002; McCrae, 1996). The behavioral tendencies typically associated with Openness to Experience include being imaginative, cultured, curious, original, broad-minded, intelligent (Digman, 1990), and having a need for variety, aesthetic sensitivity, and unconventional values (McCrae & John, 1992).

### *1.2. Organizational commitment*

Although multiple definitions of organizational commitment have been proposed, they each share the view that commitment is a psychological state that characterizes an employee's relationship with his or her organization and has implications for that employee continuing membership in the organization (see Meyer & Allen, 1997). What has traditionally differed among these definitions of organizational commitment is the nature of the psychological state being described (e.g., Becker, 1960; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Wiener, 1982). In order to acknowledge these differences, Meyer and Allen (1991) developed a three-component model of organizational commitment.

The first component is affective commitment, which refers to an employee's "emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in an organization" (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). The next component is continuance commitment, which refers to an employee's perceptions of the costs associated with leaving an organization. These costs can either be work-related (e.g., wasted time and effort acquiring non-transferable skills) or nonwork-related (e.g., relocation costs). The last component is normative commitment, which refers to an employee's feelings of obligation to remain in his or her organization.

### *1.3. Relationships between the Big Five and organizational commitment*

#### *1.3.1. Affective commitment*

Given that affective commitment represents an employee's positive emotional reaction to the organization and positive emotionality is at the core of Extraversion (Watson & Clark, 1997), it is reasonable to assume that those high in Extraversion should experience higher affective commitment than those who are less extraverted. In fact, studies have found significant bivariate correlations between positive emotionality and affective commitment in the expected positive direction (Cropanzano et al., 1993; Williams, Gavin, & Williams, 1996).

Alternatively, Neuroticism should not relate to affective commitment because neurotic individuals tend to experience negative affect (Emmons, Diener, & Larsen, 1985), which should reduce their likelihood of developing a positive emotional reaction to their organization. In addition, Conscientiousness should not relate to this component of commitment because it has been argued to relate to a generalized work-involvement tendency (Organ & Lingl, 1995) but not an organizational-involvement tendency. As research has demonstrated, people are capable of becoming com-

mitted to various facets of the workplace including the job, occupation, and organization (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005), and such foci-specific commitments do not necessarily have to be congruent with each other (Reichers, 1985).

Furthermore, Openness to Experience should not relate to affective commitment because research has noted that it is a “double-edged sword” that predisposes individuals to feel both the bad and the good more intensely” (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998, p. 199), leaving its directional influence on affective reactions like affective commitment unclear. Lastly, Agreeableness is not expected to relate to affective commitment because previous studies have found negative relationships with Agreeableness and positive affective reactions such as job satisfaction (see Judge et al., 2002). Based on the preceding logic,

**Hypothesis 1.** Extraversion will positively relate to affective commitment.

### *1.3.2. Continuance commitment*

One way in which continuance commitment develops is through an employee’s perceptions of employment alternatives. Specifically, employees who perceive that they have several viable alternatives will have weaker continuance commitment than those employees who perceive that they have few alternatives (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Because extraverts tend to be more socially active, they may develop more social contacts than introverts. Moreover, because extraverts tend to get more of what they want out of social interactions, they may perceive more job alternatives than introverts (Watson & Clark, 1997). Therefore,

**Hypothesis 2.** Extraversion will negatively relate to continuance commitment.

It has been shown that neurotic individuals tend to experience more negative life events than other individuals (Magnus, Diener, Fujita, & Pavot, 1993). These findings directly relate to continuance commitment, which may develop out of an employee’s fear of the costs associated with leaving his or her current position (Meyer & Allen, 1997). To the extent that negative events occur in a neurotic’s job, he or she may feel more apprehensive about facing a new work environment that could provide even harsher experiences. Thus,

**Hypothesis 3.** Neuroticism will positively relate to continuance commitment.

Organ and Lingl (1995) suggested that Conscientiousness related to job satisfaction because it represents a general work-involvement tendency that provides increased opportunity for an employee to obtain formal (e.g., pay, promotion) and informal work rewards (e.g., recognition, respect). To the extent that a conscientious employee earns such rewards, he or she should have heightened levels of continuance commitment because the costs of leaving an organization have increased. As such,

**Hypothesis 4.** Conscientiousness will positively relate to continuance commitment.

Alternatively, Agreeableness and Openness to Experience are not hypothesized to relate to continuance commitment. Although individuals high on Agreeableness often demonstrate respectful and proper workplace behavior (Organ & Lingl, 1995), it is unlikely that this appropriate behavior would be rewarded because it is expected, thereby failing to increase the costs associated with leaving an organization. Finally, Openness to Experience is not hypothesized to relate to contin-

uance commitment because it has been related to divergent thinking (McCrae, 1996), suggesting that formal and informal rewards that generally bind employees to their organizations may not apply to those high on this personality dimension.

### 1.3.3. Normative commitment

Normative commitment develops from the investments that an organization makes in its employees (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Specifically, when an organization upholds its end of the psychological contract, which represents an employee's beliefs about the mutual obligations between him or her and the organization (Meyer et al., 2002), that individual will feel indebted to his or her organization and want to reciprocate his or her organization's initiatives. Because positive emotionality is at the core of Extraversion, extraverted employees may seek out more social interactions within the workplace and find these interactions more rewarding than introverts (Watson & Clark, 1997). These experiences may lead extraverted employees to reciprocate the organization for providing a context for these satisfying interpersonal exchanges. Thus,

**Hypothesis 5.** Extraversion will positively relate to normative commitment.

Alternatively, Neuroticism, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, and Agreeableness should not relate to normative commitment. Neurotics tend to worry excessively (Barrick & Mount, 1991), which should diminish thoughts that their organization has upheld its end of the psychological contract. Openness to Experience is related to divergent thinking (McCrae, 1996), suggesting that those high on Openness may not value things that are often valued, such as organizational investments. Conscientiousness is not expected to relate to normative commitment because it has been argued to reflect a "virtue is its own reward" ethic (Organ & Lingl, 1995, p. 341), which suggests that highly conscientious employees will work hard regardless of whether they perceive their organization has invested in them. Lastly, those high on Agreeableness have been found to get along with coworkers in pleasurable ways (Organ & Lingl, 1995), however it is unclear whether this pleasant behavior would serve as a catalyst for, or reaction to, an organization upholding its end of the psychological contract.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Sample

A sample of 183 employees was obtained from an automobile manufacturer. An 80.61% response rate (183 out of 227 possible respondents) was obtained. The gender composition of the sample was 87.4% male ( $N = 160$ ) and 12.6% female ( $N = 23$ ). The average age of the respondents was 37.19 years ( $SD = 5.67$ ). On average, respondents had worked in their present jobs for 2.06 years ( $SD = .91$ ) and for their organization for 7.05 years ( $SD = 2.03$ ).

### 2.2. Procedure

One of the authors secured permission from an automobile manufacturer to collect data from its employees. A week before receiving the survey, those employees received a letter from the Vice

President who was in charge of the Human Resource Department, illustrating the importance of the survey for improving management practices and asking for their voluntary participation. The survey was then distributed to each employee along with a cover letter assuring them that their responses would be kept confidential and that participation was voluntary. The survey was administered during company time and employee responded on answer sheets, which were later sent to the researchers.

### *2.3. Measurements*

#### *2.3.1. The Big Five*

Given that previous research (i.e., [Goldberg, 1992](#)) has noted that small sets of variables can serve as markers of the Big-Five structure, we used [Saucier's \(1994\)](#) Big-Five personality markers to assess the five-factor model of personality. This forty-item scale is measured on a Likert-type anchoring ranging from extremely inaccurate (1) to extremely accurate (9), and contains five dimensions corresponding to the five factors of personality: Extraversion, Neuroticism, Agreeableness, Openness, and Conscientiousness. Sample items for each of the dimensions are as follows: "Talkative" (for Extraversion), "Moody" (for Neuroticism), "Sympathetic" (for Agreeableness), "Creative" (for Openness), and "Organized" (for Conscientiousness). The reliabilities for each facet were as follows: Extraversion (.83), Neuroticism (.83), Agreeableness (.88), Openness (.90), and Conscientiousness (.86).

#### *2.3.2. Affective commitment*

Affective commitment to the organization was measured by the revised Affective Commitment Scale ([Meyer & Allen, 1997](#)). Responses were made on a seven-point Likert-type anchoring that ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). A sample item states, "I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization." The reliability of this 6-item scale was .82.

#### *2.3.3. Continuance commitment*

Continuance commitment to the organization was measured by the revised Continuance Commitment Scale ([Meyer & Allen, 1997](#)). Responses were made on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). A sample item is, "I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up." The reliability of this 7-item scale was .88.

#### *2.3.4. Normative commitment*

Normative commitment to the organization was measured using the revised Normative Commitment Scale ([Meyer & Allen, 1997](#)). Responses were made on a seven-point Likert-type anchoring that ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). A sample item states, "I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer." The reliability of this 6-item scale was .89.

#### *2.3.5. Control variables*

To control for potential demographic effects, we included age, gender, job tenure, and organizational tenure as control variables. Previous research has indicated that age and tenure (organi-



zation and position) correlate positively, albeit slightly, with all three components of commitment and that gender correlates negatively, albeit weakly, with affective and normative commitment (Meyer et al., 2002).

### 3. Results

Table 1 lists the means, standard deviations, partial correlations, and reliabilities for the variables. The partial correlations provided some initial support for our hypotheses. In support of Hypothesis 1, Extraversion was positively correlated with affective commitment ( $r = .20$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Extraversion was negatively correlated with continuance commitment ( $r = -.22$ ,  $p < .01$ ), supporting Hypothesis 2. In support of Hypothesis 3, Neuroticism was positively correlated with continuance commitment ( $r = .25$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Conscientiousness was positively correlated with continuance commitment ( $r = .21$ ,  $p < .01$ ), supporting Hypothesis 4. In support of Hypothesis 5, Extraversion was positively correlated with normative commitment ( $r = .17$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Although not hypothesized, we found significant correlations between Conscientiousness and affective commitment ( $r = .18$ ,  $p < .05$ ), Openness to Experience and continuance commitment ( $r = -.23$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and Agreeableness and normative commitment ( $r = .19$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

To test our hypotheses, we performed a hierarchical regression analysis for each component of commitment.<sup>1</sup> Our goal was to determine if the hypothesized personality dimensions added a unique contribution in the prediction of the criterion above and beyond the control variables and other personality dimensions. As such, we first entered the control variables (e.g., demographics) into the equation. Next, we added the personality dimensions not hypothesized to have relationships with the criterion. Last, we entered the hypothesized personality dimension.<sup>2</sup> In the discussion of our results all reported coefficients are standardized.

In testing the Extraversion-affective commitment relationship, of the control variables, only job tenure was significant when included in the first step ( $\beta = .19$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Although the unhypothesized personality dimensions did not account for variance above and beyond the control variables in step 2, when Extraversion was added at step 3, it explained an additional 2% of variance ( $\Delta F = 4.38$ ,  $p < .05$ ). As expected, there was a positive relationship between Extraversion and affective commitment ( $\beta = .16$ ,  $p < .05$ ), supporting Hypothesis 1.

For the Extraversion-continuance commitment analysis, the unhypothesized personality dimensions explained an additional 18% of variance ( $\Delta F = 9.39$ ,  $p < .01$ ) at step 2. When Extraversion was added in the third step, it explained an additional 4% of variance ( $\Delta F = 8.13$ ,  $p < .01$ ). In further support of Hypothesis 2, Extraversion was also negatively related to continuance commitment ( $\beta = -.21$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

In testing the Neuroticism-continuance commitment relationship, the unhypothesized personality dimensions explained an additional 16% of variance ( $\Delta F = 8.26$ ,  $p < .01$ ) at step 2 and Neuroticism accounted for 6% more variance in the third step ( $\Delta F = 12.10$ ,  $p < .01$ ). As expected,

<sup>1</sup> Tables of our hierarchical regression analyses are available upon request from the first author.

<sup>2</sup> For exploratory purposes, hierarchical regression analyses were performed for the personality dimensions not specifically hypothesized to have relationships with organizational commitment.

Table 1

Means, standard deviations, partial correlations, and coefficient alphas of study variables

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Age	37.19	5.67								
Gender	.13	.33								
Job tenure	2.06	.91								
Organizational tenure	7.05	2.03								
1. Extraversion	5.30	1.38	(.83)							
2. Neuroticism	4.19	1.46	-.28**	(.83)						
3. Agreeableness	6.53	1.40	.20**	-.28**	(.88)					
4. Openness to Experience	5.99	1.49	.20**	-.18*	.12	(.90)				
5. Conscientiousness	5.64	1.35	.24**	-.22**	.27**	.05	(.86)			
6. Affective commitment	4.43	1.27	.20**	-.13	.05	-.04	.18*	(.82)		
7. Continuance commitment	4.38	1.48	-.22**	.25**	.02	-.23**	.21**	-.01	(.88)	
8. Normative commitment	4.32	1.27	.17*	.03	.19*	.05	.04	.50**	.14	(.89)

Note:  $N = 183$ .\*  $p < .05$ .\*\*  $p < .01$  (two-tailed).

there was a positive relationship between Neuroticism and continuance commitment ( $\beta = .26$ ,  $p < .01$ ), supporting [Hypothesis 3](#).

In testing the Conscientiousness-continuance commitment relationship, at step 2, the unhypothesized personality dimensions explained an additional 13% of variance ( $\Delta F = 6.52$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and Conscientiousness accounted for 8% more variance in the third step ( $\Delta F = 18.52$ ,  $p < .01$ ). In support of [Hypothesis 4](#), Conscientiousness was positively related to continuance commitment ( $\beta = .31$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Although unhypothesized, we also found that Openness to Experience was negatively related to continuance commitment ( $\beta = -.17$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and explained an additional 3% of variance in the final step of the analysis ( $\Delta F = 5.57$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

In testing the Extraversion-normative commitment relationship, we found that Extraversion explained an additional 2% of variance in step 3 ( $\Delta F = 4.67$ ,  $p < .05$ ), despite the unhypothesized personality variables not accounting for significant variance above and beyond the control variables at step 2. As expected, Extraversion was positively related to normative commitment ( $\beta = .17$ ,  $p < .05$ ), supporting [Hypothesis 5](#). Although unhypothesized, we also found that Agreeableness was positively related to normative commitment ( $\beta = .20$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and explained an additional 3% of variance in the final step of the analysis ( $\Delta F = 6.20$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

#### 4. Discussion

Current results suggest that the five-factor model serves as an informative framework in examining the dispositional sources of organizational commitment. Specifically, Extraversion emerged as the most consistent predictor, significantly relating to all three forms of organizational commitment. First, consistent with previous findings that positive emotionality and affective commitment are positively related ([Thoresen et al., 2003](#)), Extraversion was positively related to affective commitment because positive emotionality is at the core of this personality dimension ([Watson et al.,](#)



1988). Second, Extraversion was negatively related to continuance commitment. Possibly, due to their nature, extraverts are more likely to network and perceive job alternatives than introverts (Watson & Clark, 1997). Finally, Extraversion was positively related to normative commitment. Because normative commitment develops from norms of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), extraverts may be inclined to reciprocate their organization because they believe it upholds the psychological contract by providing an exemplary social environment (Watson, 2000).

Interestingly, the direction of the correlation between Neuroticism and organizational commitment varied according to the specified component of commitment. Neuroticism displayed a negative (nonsignificant) relationship with affective commitment, a positive relationship with continuance commitment, and a positive (nonsignificant) relationship with normative commitment. Due to their nature, neurotics are prone to experiencing negative situations (Magnus et al., 1993) and negative affect (Emmons et al., 1985), which may make them wary of becoming emotionally invested in their organizations, conscious of the costs associated with leaving a job, and aware of the atypical investments their employing organization makes in them, fostering in return, a need to reciprocate. These findings are also consistent with previous research that has shown Extraversion and Neuroticism to be inversely related to important work outcomes such as job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991) and job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2002).

Although Conscientiousness did not significantly predict affective commitment, this personality dimension was significantly correlated with affective commitment, suggesting that a possible relationship exists between the two constructs. Because conscientious individuals tend to get highly involved in their jobs (Organ & Lingl, 1995), possibly this involvement extends to the organization as well. As expected, Conscientiousness was positively related to continuance commitment because increased job involvement should lead to an accumulation of workplace rewards that heighten the costs associated with leaving an organization.

We also found unhypothesized relationships between Openness to Experience and continuance commitment and Agreeableness and normative commitment. Since Openness to Experience can be viewed as an individual's need for "novelty, variety, and complexity and an intrinsic appreciation for experience" (p. 326, McCrae, 1996), we speculate that people who score high on the Openness dimension are more exploratory and more willing to pursue job alternatives than those who score low on this dimension. In regard to Agreeableness, it has been related to getting along with others in pleasant and satisfying ways (Organ & Lingl, 1995), which directly relates to emotional warmth. Such emotion may increase an employee's social identity with his or her work environment, thereby increasing his or her need to reciprocate the organization for providing a supportive social environment.

#### *4.1. Theoretical and practical implications*

Theoretically, the current results suggest that personality plays an important role in the development of organizational commitment, extending the validity of the personality-job attitudes linkage to organizational commitment. This extension has implications for the study of antecedents of other job attitudes (e.g., job involvement and job embeddedness) as they may have dispositional sources as well.

The results also imply that the Big Five is a useful framework to explain the personological basis of organizational commitment. It should be noted that other frameworks such as the PA–NA

typology of affective dispositions can, and have, been used to explain the dispositional sources of commitment. Nevertheless, two reasons encourage the use of the five-factor model. First, compared to the PA–NA typology, the five-factor model contains three additional traits that are important to the prediction of all three forms of commitment. Second, as Judge et al. (2002) argued, PA and NA are less stable than other dispositional measures and may be confounded with life satisfaction.

Practically speaking, the past two decades have witnessed a revolution in personnel selection largely due to the publication of meta-analyses demonstrating that the Big Five have significant correlations with important job criteria (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997). The results of this study suggest that organizational commitment may be included on this list of constructs that are related to personality. Meta-analysis has indicated that employees with low levels of commitment are more likely to leave their organizations (Meyer et al., 2002). Given that organizational commitment is an important antecedent of turnover, the predictive effect of personality on organizational commitment may have important practical utility. Instead of only focusing on post-entry work experiences, organizations may also adopt selection procedures based on personality measures to evoke high levels of organizational commitment from their employees.

#### *4.2. Limitations and future directions*

Like all research, there are limitations to this study that must be taken into consideration. First, the data were cross-sectional in nature and this restriction prevents the inference of causality. At a minimum, a longitudinal design is required to infer any causality that may exist among these variables. Second, the results may have been affected by common method bias because all of our data were collected from self-report measures. A primary concern of common method variance is that the relationships observed between variables may be due to the measurement method rather than the hypothesized relationships between constructs (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). Nevertheless, CFA and EFA analyses (not reported here) supported the clear distinction among all the variables included in the current study, indicating that common method variance should not have affected our results to a great extent. In addition, research has suggested that the effects of common method variance may be reduced if items on a questionnaire are reordered such that the dependent variable follows the independent variable (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). This method was followed in the design of our questionnaire.

Finally, the effect sizes for the relationships of interest were relatively small. This suggests the possibility of unknown moderator or mediator variables on the personality-commitment relationship. Organizational variables such as job characteristics, rewards, and the manner in which an organization treats its employees may be of particular relevance because each of these variables has been considered an antecedent of each form of commitment (see Meyer & Allen, 1997). Unfortunately, data were not collected in regard to possible moderators or mediators because such hypotheses were beyond the scope of this study.

These limitations aside, the present research extends the literature on the antecedents of organizational commitment in several ways. First, the findings demonstrate the applicability of the five-factor model of personality in predicting the three forms of commitment. Such a model provides a more holistic perspective on the relationship between personality and organizational commitment than other typologies, and consequently, a new line of research in the antecedents

literature for organizational commitment. Second, our findings have practical implications for organizational selection. Future studies may seek to explore the utility of using personality tests to predict organizational commitment in a selection setting.

## References

- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1–26.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32–42.
- Cooper-Hakim, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 241–259.
- Cropanzano, R., James, K., & Konovsky, M. A. (1993). Dispositional affectivity as a predictor of work attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 595–606.
- DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 197–229.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 21, 417–440.
- Eagley, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Emmons, R. A., Diener, E., & Larsen, R. J. (1985). Choice of situations and congruence models of interactionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 693–702.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 26–42.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 165–167.
- House, R. J., Shane, S. A., & Herold, D. M. (1996). Rumors of the death of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 203–224.
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-Factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 530–541.
- Lawler, E. J. (1992). Affective attachment to nested groups: A choice process theory. *American Sociological Review*, 57, 327–339.
- Magnus, K., Diener, E., Fujita, F., & Pavot, W. (1993). Extraversion and neuroticism as predictors of objective life events: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 1046–1053.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171–194.
- McCrae, R. R. (1996). Social consequences of experiential openness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 323–337.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 2, 175–215.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61–89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application*. California: Sage Publishers Inc.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20–52.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224–247.
- Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 135, 339–350.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12, 531–544.

- Reichers, A. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 10, 465–476.
- Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European Community. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 30–43.
- Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-Markers: A brief version of Goldberg's unipolar Big-Five markers. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 63, 506–516.
- Staw, B. M., & Ross, J. (1985). Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 469–480.
- Thoresen, C. J., Kaplan, S. A., Barsky, A. P., Warren, C. R., & de Chermont, K. (2003). The affective underpinnings of job perceptions and attitudes: A meta-analytic review and integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 914–945.
- Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and temperament*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1997). Extraversion and its positive emotional core. In S. R. Briggs, W. H. Jones, & R. Hogan (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology*. New York: Academic Press.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063–1070.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418–428.
- Williams, L. J., Gavin, M. B., & Williams, M. L. (1996). Measurement and nonmeasurement processes with negative affectivity and employee attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 88–101.